From:

Christina Tartaglia [ckaralis@yahoo.com]

Sent:

Monday, October 18, 2004 1:50 PM

To:

**KJMWEB** 

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Christina Tartaglia 179 Mosley road Rochester, NY 14616

October 18, 2004

Kevin J Martin

#### Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Christina Tartaglia (585) 663-1365

From: Sent: Chrystal Johnson [Jaxjagz05@aol.com] Monday, October 18, 2004 4:08 AM

To:

Michael Powell

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Chrystal Johnson 4684 Geiger Road Milton, Florida 32583

October 18, 2004

Michael K Powell

#### Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From: Sent:

Chrystal Johnson [Jaxjagz05@aol.com] Monday, October 18, 2004 4:08 AM

To:

KAQuinn

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Chrystal Johnson 4684 Geiger Road Milton, Florida 32583

October 18, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From: Sent:

Chrystal Johnson [Jaxjagz05@aol.com] Monday, October 18, 2004 4:08 AM

To: Subject: Commissioner Adelstein
Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Chrystal Johnson 4684 Geiger Road Milton, Florida 32583

October 18, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From: Sent: Chrystal Johnson [Jaxjagz05@aol.com] Monday, October 18, 2004 4:08 AM

To:

KJMWEB

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Chrystal Johnson 4684 Geiger Road Milton, Florida 32583

October 18, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From:

Cindy Rose Coleman [crosecoleman@bellsouth.net]

Sent:

Saturday, October 16, 2004 10:08 PM

To: Subject: Commissioner Adelstein Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Cindy Rose Coleman 4616 Crosshill Lane Northport, AL 35473

October 16, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cindy Rose Coleman 205-339-8972

From: Sent:

Cindy Rose Coleman [crosecoleman@bellsouth.net]

Sent

Saturday, October 16, 2004 10:08 PM

To:

KAQuinn

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Cindy Rose Coleman 4616 Crosshill Lane Northport, AL 35473

October 16, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cindy Rose Coleman 205-339-8972

From:

Cindy Rose Coleman [crosecoleman@bellsouth.net]

Sent:

Saturday, October 16, 2004 10:08 PM

To:

Michael Powell

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Cindy Rose Coleman 4616 Crosshill Lane Northport, AL 35473

October 16, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cindy Rose Coleman 205-339-8972

From:

Cindy Rose Coleman [crosecoleman@bellsouth.net]

Sent:

Saturday, October 16, 2004 10:08 PM

To:

KJMWEB

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Cindy Rose Coleman 4616 Crosshill Lane Northport, AL 35473

October 16, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cindy Rose Coleman 205-339-8972

From: Sent:

clara davis [teaandco10@aol.com] Tuesday, October 19, 2004 7:21 PM

To:

KAQuinn

Subject:

Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

clara davis 204 smith ave monroe, la 71203

October 19, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From: Sent: clara davis [teaandco10@aol.com] Tuesday, October 19, 2004 7:21 PM

To: Subject: Commissioner Adelstein Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

clara davis 204 smith ave monroe, la 71203

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

,

#### Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From: Sent:

clara davis [teaandco10@aol.com] Tuesday, October 19, 2004 7:21 PM

To:

Commissioner Adelstein

Subject:

Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

clara davis 204 smith ave monroe, la 71203

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From:

clara davis [teaandco10@aol.com] Tuesday, October 19, 2004 7:21 PM

Sent: To:

Michael Powell

Subject:

Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

clara davis 204 smith ave monroe, la 71203

October 19, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From:

Ciara Moore [cam2003@sbcglobal.net] Sunday, October 17, 2004 8:03 PM

Sent:

To:

KAQuinn

Subject:

Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Clara Moore Retired Administrative Computer Assistant/Secretary 1300 Roosevelt Ave. Apt. #406 Richmond, CA 94801

October 17, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From: Sent: Clara Moore [cam2003@sbcglobal.net] Sunday, October 17, 2004 8:03 PM

To: Subject: Commissioner Adelstein Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Clara Moore

Retired Administrative Computer Assistant/Secretary 1300 Roosevelt Ave. Apt. #406 Richmond, CA 94801

October 17, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From: Sent: Clara Moore [cam2003@sbcglobal.net] Sunday, October 17, 2004 8:03 PM

To:

**KJMWEB** 

Subject:

Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Clara Moore
Retired Administrative Computer Assistant/Secretary
1300 Roosevelt Ave. Apt. #406
Richmond, CA 94801

October 17, 2004

Kevin J Martin

#### Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From: Sent:

Clara Moore [cam2003@sbcglobal.net] Sunday, October 17, 2004 8:03 PM

To:

Michael Powell

Subject:

Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Clara Moore Retired Administrative Computer Assistant/Secretary 1300 Roosevelt Ave. Apt. #406 Richmond, CA 94801

October 17, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

From:

Clinton& Brenda Crawley [buddykc3@clicksouth.net]

Sent:

Saturday, October 16, 2004 4:14 PM

To:

**KAQuinn** 

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Clinton& Brenda Crawley 2318 Vaughn Road Griffin, Georgia 30223

October 16, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Clinton & Brenda Crawley 770-229-5861

From:

Clinton& Brenda Crawley [buddykc3@clicksouth.net]

Sent:

Saturday, October 16, 2004 4:14 PM

To: Subject: Commissioner Adelstein
Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Clinton& Brenda Crawley 2318 Vaughn Road Griffin, Georgia 30223

October 16, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Clinton & Brenda Crawley 770-229-5861

From: Sent:

Clinton& Brenda Crawley [buddykc3@clicksouth.net]

Sent:

Saturday, October 16, 2004 4:14 PM

To:

Michael Powell

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Clinton& Brenda Crawley 2318 Vaughn Road Griffin, Georgia 30223

October 16, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Clinton & Brenda Crawley 770-229-5861

From:

Clinton& Brenda Crawley [buddykc3@clicksouth.net]

Sent:

Saturday, October 16, 2004 4:14 PM

To:

**KJMWEB** 

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Clinton& Brenda Crawley 2318 Vaughn Road Griffin, Georgia 30223

October 16, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Clinton & Brenda Crawley 770-229-5861

From:

Clyda Stiles [rlsti@cox.net]

Sent:

Tuesday, October 19, 2004 6:54 PM

To: Subject: Commissioner Adelstein No on "A La Carte" Cable

Clyda Stiles 1812 S Lynn Lane Tulsa, OK 74108

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Clyda Stiles (918)437-5885

From:

CMEGGS762@aol.com

Sent:

Wednesday, September 29, 2004 1:53 AM

To:

Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Jonathan Adelstein

Subject:

"A LA CARTE"

# FYI,

THIS IS A COPY OF THE EMAIL I HAVE SENT TO MY CONGRESSMAN. PLEASE DON'T LET THIS PASS.

#### **DEAR SIR:**

I HAVE RECENTLY LEARNED OF THE "A LA CARTE" PROPOSAL AND AM WRITING IN HOPE THAT YOU WILL NOT SUPPORT THIS.

I WATCH 2 SHOWS WEEKLY WHILE OUT OF TOWN FOR WORK THAT WILL BE CUT OUT IF THIS PASSES. THESE SHOWS ARE VERY IMPORTANT TO ME AND HELP ME TO RECHARGE FROM THE STRESS OF WORK. I AM A NURSE AND MY PATIENTS ALSO WATCH THESE SHOWS AND THEY NEED THEM. IT GIVES THEM HOPE. THE HOSPITAL DOES NOT SUPPLY CABLE. PLEASE DON'T SUPPORT THIS.

THERE ARE ALSO THE PEOPLE IN JAIL TO CONSIDER. I DOUBT THEY GIVE THEM CABLE THERE AND THIS IS THE BEST PROGRAMMING THEY COULD POSSIBLY GET.

PLEASE DON'T LET THIS PASS.

THANK YOU, CHERYL AUTRY

From: Sent: Colleen Durrett [teddy68@verizon.net] Tuesday, October 19, 2004 10:59 PM

To: Subject: Commissioner Adelstein Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Colleen Durrett rt. 2 Box 216A Beverly, WV 26253

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Colleen H.Durrett 304-637-4405

From: Sent: Colleen Durrett [teddy68@verizon.net] Tuesday, October 19, 2004 10:59 PM

To:

KAQuinn

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Colleen Durrett rt. 2 Box 216A Beverly, WV 26253

October 19, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Colleen H.Durrett 304-637-4405

From: Sent: Colleen Durrett [teddy68@verizon.net] Tuesday. October 19, 2004 10:59 PM

To:

Michael Powell

Subject:

Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Colleen Durrett rt. 2 Box 216A Beverly, WV 26253

October 19, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Colleen H.Durrett 304-637-4405

From: Sent: Colleen O'Connor [colleen@lsu.edu] Tuesday, October 19, 2004 8:04 PM

To:

KAQuinn

Subject:

Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Colleen O'Connor 3019 Constance New Orleans, LA 70115

October 19, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this because I understand this may limit the freedom of preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to ALL people.

Sincerely,

From: Sent:

Colleen O'Connor [colleen@lsu.edu] Tuesday, October 19, 2004 8:04 PM

To:

Michael Powell

Subject:

Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Colleen O'Connor 3019 Constance New Orleans, LA 70115

October 19, 2004

Michael K Powell

,

#### Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this because I understand this may limit the freedom of preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to ALL people.

Sincerely,

From: Sent: Colleen O'Connor [colleen@lsu.edu] Tuesday, October 19, 2004 8:04 PM

To: Subject: Commissioner Adelstein Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Colleen O'Connor 3019 Constance New Orleans, LA 70115

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this because I understand this may limit the freedom of preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to ALL people.

Sincerely,

From: Sent:

Colleen O'Connor [colleen@lsu.edu]

To:

Tuesday, October 19, 2004 8:04 PM Commissioner Adelstein

Subject:

Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Colleen O'Connor 3019 Constance New Orleans, LA 70115

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this because I understand this may limit the freedom of preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to ALL people.

Sincerely,